DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 657 EA 004 028

TITLE	School Board Policies on Teacher Evaluation. Educational Policies Development Kit.
INSTITUTION	National School Boards Association, Waterford, Conn. Educational Policies Service.
REPORT NO	Cat-71-44
PUB DATE	Oct 71
NOTE	32p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National School Boards Association, State National Bank Plaza, Evanston, Illinois 60201, (Kit #71-44, 1-3 kits $2.00, quantity discounts)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Board of Education Policy; *Boards of Education; *Guidelines; *Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Improvement; Teachers; *Teaching Quality

ABSTRACT

This report provides school district policy samples and other resources on teacher evaluation. The intent in providing policy samples is to encourage thinking in policy terms and to provide working papers that can be edited, modified, or adapted to meet local requirements. Note is made of the fact that, when school boards evaluate teachers, they are obligated to procure the best possible instruction for all students. Three basic evaluation policy elements are set forth: (1) that the teacher being evaluated should be a partner in the process, (2) that evaluation must take a balanced, humane view of everything the teacher does that affects students, and (3) that many things have to happen to the evaluator as well as to the teacher being evaluated. (Author/JF)

ED 058657

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Educational Policies Development Kit

a component of the Educational Policies Service

EA 004 028

1

NSBA
NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

ED 058657

SCHOOL BOARD POLICIES ON TEACHER EVALUATION

Cat. no. 71-44 *October, 1971*

This is the fifth in the 1971 series of six kit-booklets issued to help school boards develop written policies in key subject areas. All policy samples and other policy resources reproduced herein have been selected from the files of the Policy Information Clearinghouse of the National School Boards Association's Educational Policies Service (EPS/NSBA) and coded to the EPS/NSBA policy codification system.

The intent in providing policy samples is to encourage thinking in policy terms; to provide "something to start with"--working papers to be edited, modified, or adapted to meet local requirements. Administrators of EPS/NSBA member organizations should file this booklet for continuing reference in their master copy of the Educational Policies Reference Manual.

These materials are disseminated for information only and do not necessarily reflect official viewpoints of the National School Boards Association.

Additional kits may be ordered from the National School Boards Association, State National Bank Plaza, Evanston, Illinois 60201 at the following rates: 1-3 kits @ $2.00; 4-7 kits @ $1.80; 8-10 kits @ $1.60; 11 or more kits @ $1.50. Postage and handling charge added unless payment accompanies order--and payment should accompany all orders under $6.00 in value.

EPS/NSBA POLICY INFORMATION CLEARINGHOUSE
152 Cross Road Waterford, Conn. 06385

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
National School Boards Association
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER"

EPS File:
GBI--Professional Staff
Evaluation

Introduction

The phone rings. A parent complaints to you, a board member, about the way a teacher loads up the kids with homework. Next week, another call, another parent. This time a compliment: Miss Kowalski certainly helped my kid get over that reading hurdle.

On the phone, in the street, in the grocery, or by mail, parents often get the eye and the ear of board members to praise or criticize the performance of teachers.

This is evaluation--of a sort. Let's rephrase that: This is evaluation? Of a sort, yes. Certainly, parents who buttonhole you are engaged in evaluating teachers--or single acts of teachers. Unless you are superhuman, you will also be forming opinions about the teachers that the parents call to your attention.

Your good sense should tell you not to be influenced by the isolated opinions of individual parents. In fact, serving as the listening post to parent feelings about teacher behavior may be a job for the professional staff rather than for you as a board member.

Your role is bigger: to explore--and agree, if possible--with other members on your board as to what kind of teachers and what sort of teaching you want in your schools. This definitely involves assessing, judging, and evaluating the faculty you now have and how its members function in the classroom and out.

A philosopher once said the unexamined life may not be worth living. By the same token, an unevaluated faculty may not be worth paying. Just as the board has the power to decide which teachers to hire, it has power to decide which to keep and which to dismiss--provided the procedure is rational, legal, and in the interests of students.

c Copyright 1971 National School Boards Association

It follows, however, that you also have to decide how this evaluation is to take place in your system; who is to do it; and what you want to happen as a result. That done, you may leave the mechanics to the administration.

However, leaving the mechanics to the administration suggests that you reserve for yourself the grand task of formulating policy. Only this way can you walk that golden middle line between the extreme of getting entangled in judging individual teachers and how they teach, and the other extreme of leaving it all to the administration. For, the art of being a board member, in a nutshell, is deciding on what results you want and then asking the administration to work for these results.

Keeping the Student in the Center

One result that you must help bring about--it's your duty to do so as a board member--is to assure the best possible instruction for every student in your district. It is for this reason that you have the authority to spend tax dollars, to select and employ teachers, and to give them the tools needed to guarantee each student's educational progress.

Keeping the student in the center of your thinking is a good thing to do in all school board actions. It is especially important when the problem of teacher evaluation comes up. It helps us remember that we're not so much concerned with individual traits of individual teachers as with the total impact of the teacher upon the student. It helps us remember that the purpose of evaluation is not to judge the private life, personality, or even teaching styles of faculty members. The big purpose of evaluation is to get answers to such questions as:

--Is the teacher capable of providing the best possible instruction for the students?
--Is the teacher capable of improving his instruction to meet the needs of students?

If you accept this notion, see that it gets written into your policy statements. Get it across to your administration. Ask your administration to work out the procedures and get the instruments to make this idea a reality. The results--in the long run--should raise the quality of education in your district.

Judge We Must--But With a Purpose

When you ask your administration to set into motion a plan for evaluation of instructional staff, you're asking for no simple task. Some even say it can't be done; they remember the injunction, Judge not, lest ye be judged. Other reply: Judge we must. They rely upon a scientific principle: whatever exists

can be measured or evaluated in its quanity, quality, or its effect. Teachers and teaching exists: ergo, it should be possible to evaluate them.

Possibly so. But teachers being professionals, and teaching being a function which utilizes art, skill, character, enthusiasm, and love--to mention but a few of its ingredients--obviously cannot be stamped like grades of beef. So don't expect simple solutions, simple forms, simple answers, simple computer print-outs, or simple yes-no answers to do the job. Charity, patience, and tolerance should be the board's attitude as the administration works out its evaluation tools and approaches.

You should expect your administration to use the most successful methods and tools which have been tested for use in evaluative work. There are many, possibly hundreds, of different ways and means to do the job. What works for one school system, may work only partially for another. The instruments used in a large system may offer a few good points for a smaller school system. Flexibility and an attitude of let's-try-it-and-see-if-it-works should characterize the board's feelings toward the process. And this should be so indicated in the policy statements.

Three Basic Policy Elements

There are, however, three firm notions about evaluation which have been widely accepted.

1. The first is that the teacher being evaluated should be a partner in the process. He should be involved with the principal, or the supervisor, or the superintendent (and others) in the task. This implies that evaluation is not something that is done to teachers; it is done with teachers. It is a cooperative undertaking, carried on with mutual respect. Everyone involved knows what's going on. Effective evaluation is not carried on behind anyone's back, or in secrecy, or by surprise pop-in visits by principals. It is carried on in a professional atmosphere that is open and friendly between individuals who are involved.

Of course, a principal or supervisor may schedule visits to the classroom to observe. But observation will be followed by conversation. For, the teacher should have every opportunity to use the principal's observation visit as a starting point for seeking ideas for improvement, for asking questions.

The teacher should also know at all times what yardsticks the administration is using while observing the teacher in action --and to question whether such yardsticks make sense.

Some negotiated contracts require that faculty and administration

agree in advance on the criteria by which teachers are to be judged. In other contracts, clauses require that these criteria be worked out together by teachers and administrators. Board policies may well incorporate such ideas because they stress partnership. They will help eliminate fear, confusion, discouragement.

They should do something more. They should encourage the teacher to take independent action toward self-evaluation. When the teacher knows he has some control over the evaluation, he'll seek a more active part in the search for better ways to do things. Evaluation will tend to become more of a do-it-yourself activity. Board policies which encourage that are good policies.

2. The second firm notion is that evaluation must take a balanced, humane view of everything the teacher does that affects students. This means that all of the functions, roles, and behaviors expected of a teacher are to be scrutinized--but with compassion. We mustn't fall into the trap of judging a teacher harshly only on the length of her miniskirt; or the size of his beard; or--on the other hand--be too favorably impressed, necessarily, because the teacher comes in early and stays late. It's what the teacher does in between-times that must be explored.

Note that the sample documents included in this kit cover a host of topics: command of subject matter; effectiveness of instruction; initiative; personality traits; leadership; growth potential; participation in professional activities. There are innumerable ways to put down on paper what is to be assessed. Many of the documents we have seen seek to analyze the pupil-teacher relationships; the working atmosphere in the classroom; the teacher's use of instructional methods; the proper balance between routine, discipline and freedom; the teacher's personal qualities--including such items as tact and neatness. No policies should require the teacher to score brownie points or rate gold starts on all of the items being evaluated. Policies should have lenience. They should take into account the variability of teacher talents. Some teachers know their subject thoroughly, but have little patience with students who do not grasp facts and ideas quickly. Some teachers balk at serving on faculty committees, but are willing to spend extra hours after school counseling students.

Is one type of talent possessed by a teacher more valuable than another--and hence to be prized more highly? Our knowledge about teaching is still too inadequate to give us a simple Yes answer. Not even experts will dare say which teacher traits and which functions are of greater importance than others for a child--or for which child and at which period in his learning development.

Your policies and regulations should take note of that fact.

They should not insist that teachers must score so much on personal grooming, so much on mastery of subject matter, so much on ability to use audiovisuals, and on down the long list of the ingredients that go into the making of a teacher. Good policies (and regulations) avoid asking for "total scores" or "composite grades." Precision is not part of the art of evaluation. Rather, seek an overall assessment of performance--and then make known that you seek further development of professional competency and improvement in instructional ability.

Which brings us to the next point.

3. The third firm notion about evaluation is that many things have to happen as its consequence--and not always to the teacher alone. The outcomes of evaluation may affect the evaluators--that is, the principal or supervisor. And the outcomes may also affect the entire learning environment or even the administrative setting. We shall see in a moment how this is likely to take place.

Some changes will be easily made as a result of evaluation. It may show Mr. Adams doing such a poor job that he must be separated from the staff. It may disclose that Mrs. Blaine is doing to well that some special incentives and new challenges may have to be granted to keep her on the staff. And certainly, evaluation should pin-point those who show sufficient promise to be granted tenure and those who do not.

Evaluation is a sharp instrument in cutting away deadwood--and that is one of its values. It will quickly help a board get rid of the 1% of the incompetents. The greater challenge is how to use evaluation to encourage greater competence in the remaining 99% of the faculty.

Board policies should emphasize that improvement and development is what evaluation seeks. It is through the evaluation process that teachers and supervisors can decide whether a faculty member needs to--

- Eliminate some points of his abrasive behavior toward pupils or parents
- Become more understanding of the needs and learning styles of children from low-income, or otherwise disadvantaged families
- Use a wider range of instructional materials
- Make more use of community resources, community leaders, field trips
- Modify homework assignments for students who have special learning problems
- Get more kids involved in classroom discussion.

A look at the other side of teacher competence may show that many a faculty has many a gem--teachers with much-prized talents, often unused or under-utilized. Evaluation can lead to exciting discoveries--teachers with unique skills for leadership, teachers with special abilities to carry on innovative programs. Upgrading and reassignment may be called for after studies of teacher strengths and weaknesses. Broad-gauged policies on evaluation can make that happen.

Finally, let's explore that point that the results of evaluation may have even wider consequences. The evaluative process says, in effect: Look to yourself evaluator-administrator. Look also to the conditions of learning and teaching. For example, the teacher isn't apt to make "constructive suggestions" if the administrator himself is known for his abruptness in cutting off discussion; the teacher isn't apt to "contribute ideas at faculty meetings" if the meetings are boring and conducted by a dictatorial chairman; the teacher isn't apt to "encourage use of the school library" if the library resources are meager and inaccesible.

Something may have to change along with the teacher--and the changes may affect the curriculum, plant, instructional materials, and administrative procedures:

By way of a summary: How often should teacher and administrator hold formal and/or informal evaluation sessions? How frequently should the board receive evaluation reports--and in what form? What should be the roles, respectively, of the department head, supervisor, principal, superintendent in the evaluation process? How should temporary, probationary, and substitute teachers be affected by the evaluation plans? What appeals machinery should be set up?

Such questions--and a host of others dealing with mechanics--should be tackled by the administration. The board should, properly, expect the administration to come up with regulations on these matters. But the administration, properly, might expect from the board a guiding philosophy--a philosophy that might be expressed by one sentence: Evaluation is a process which gives teachers the opportunities to do their very best on behalf of students.

--Ben Brodinsky
Past President, Education Press Association of America, and
Member, Old Saybrook, Conn., Board of Education

TEACHER EVALUATION
(Ten Characteristics of an Effective Evaluation Program)

1. The school board policy includes a statement of goals and objectives which view the evaluative process as a means for improving the quality of instruction.

2. All procedures, forms, job descriptions, guides, and criteria are developed cooperatively between the administration and instructional staff.

3. Evaluative criteria are explicit, encourage objective judgments, and relate as much as possible to those performances and behaviors by teachers that bear directly on the performance and behavior of students and the advancement of the instructional program.

4. The evaluative process is carried out on a continuing basis and includes opportunities for both formal and informal evaluations.

5. The process employs a variety of techniques for assessing teacher performance.

6. The process encourages a continuing self-evaluation by teachers and improvements in job performance.

7. Each observation and evaluation includes follow-up consultation between the teacher and his evaluator, and the teacher is granted the right to receive a signed copy of any written evaluation of his job performance.

8. Teachers are given the right to appeal unfavorable evaluations, through channels, to the superintendent of schools and, ultimately, to the board of education.

9. Evaluators are given training in the arts and skills of evaluation.

10. The evaluation program includes reliable measures for evaluating the performance of the evaluators.

SOURCE: EPS/NSBA Clearinghouse
DATE: October, 1971

INFORMATION STATEMENTS (green sheets) are distributed for information only. Contents are not necessarily endorsed by EPS/NSBA. Editing from originals has been for reasons of space and style requirements only.

TEACHER EVALUATION

The Board recognizes that the teaching process is an extremely complex one and that the appraisal of this process is a difficult and technical function. But because it is universally accepted that good teaching is the most important element in a sound educational program, teacher appraisal must take place.

Appraisal of teaching service should serve these purposes:

1. To serve as a learning experience for the teacher in order to improve the quality of instruction.

2. To elevate the standards of the teaching profession as a whole.

3. To aid the individual teacher to grow professionally.

4. To assist in separating from employment with the school system those teachers who do not meet minimal requirements of professional standards of teaching competency.

Evaluation of teacher performance must be a cooperative, continuing process designed to improve the quality of instruction. All professional employees are involved in the evaluation process. The teacher shares with those who work with him the responsibility for developing effective evaluation procedures and instruments and for developing and maintaining professional standards and attitudes regarding the evaluation process.

Therefore, the Board delegates to the administrative staff the responsibility of developing, organizing, and implementing a system-wide program for evaluating the instructional process as one means to insure quality instruction.

SOURCE: Fort Wayne, Ind., Community Schools
DATE: 6/9/69
LEGAL REF.: Burns Ann. Ind. St.
28-6410 Specific powers (7)

SCHOOL BOARD POLICY SAMPLES (buff sheets) are distributed for demonstration purposes. Contents are not necessarily endorsed by EPS/NSBA. Editing from originals has been for reasons of space and style requirements only.

TEACHER EVALUATION

It is the major responsibility of the education profession, as of other professions, to evaluate the quality of its services.

Both the school administration and the local association of teachers recognize their right, duty, and responsibility for the evaluation of the performance of both teachers and administration.

Evaluation is to be used as a constructive measure to counsel and guide the teacher or administrator in improving his competency.

All teachers and administration realize that evaluation is done with the teachers and not to the teachers. Periodic evaluations are to be cooperatively reviewed and acknowledged by the evaluator and the teacher, with a copy retained by the teacher.

All materials placed in the permanent central office teacher's file, and originating within the school system, shall be available to the teacher at his request for inspection. The teacher shall acknowledge that he has read such material by affixing his signature on the actual copy to be filed. Such signature does not necessarily indicate agreement with the content of such material.

The teacher shall have the right to file written comments to said evaluation. Such statement shall be attachable to the evaluation.

Evaluations are to be followed by professional counseling so that the educator is offered suggestions for improvement and demonstrations of skill by master professionals and is provided time and climate for change to take place.

There shall be a compilation of at least annual observations and evaluation of the teacher's professional services. The formal evaluation should cover all aspects of the teacher's professional service and not merely be classroom observation reports. Evaluation should show evidences of continuity and the variety of services examined.

Evaluation should continue regularly throughout the teacher's service, although, the supervisory burden will naturally be greater in the early years of teaching service. All references and information originating outside the school system on the basis of confidentiality and information obtained within the school system in the process of evaluating the teacher for employment shall not be subject to this agreement and therefore shall not be available to the teacher. Personal letters of recommendation shall not be subject to this agreement.

SOURCE: Board of Education, West Lafayette, Indiana
DATE: 6/12/70

SCHOOL BOARD POLICY SAMPLES (buff sheets) are distributed for demonstration purposes. Contents are not necessarily endorsed by EPS/NSBA. Editing from originals has been for reasons of space and style requirements only.

TEACHER EVALUATION

In order to assure a high quality of teacher and administrator performance and to advance the instructional programs of the Monroe Public Schools, a continuous program for teacher and administrator evaluation shall be established and regular reports shall be made to the Board of Education concerning the outcomes of these evaluations.

The evaluation process shall include:

--the development and periodic review of techniques and procedures for making evaluations
--interpretation of the information gained in the evaluation process in terms of the objectives of the instructional program
--and application of the information gained to the planning of staff development and inservice training activities which are designed to improve instruction and increase teacher competence.

The evaluation process shall include self-evaluation, supervisor-initiated observations, and teacher-initiated observations.

Each nontenure teacher shall receive at least two formal written evaluations during the year. Each tenure teacher shall receive at least one formal written evaluation during the year. The formal written evaluations shall result from a series of observations not from a single visit. Evaluations in addition to those detailed above are at the discretion of the administration.

The formal evaluations shall be written and shall be discussed by the supervisor and the person being evaluated. The discussions may either precede or follow the writing of the evaluation document. Copies of the written document shall be signed by both parties and be incorporated into the personal files of the teacher or administrator. In addition, the individual and his department chairman (if applicable) shall receive a signed copy. The signature should indicate that the evaluation has been read and discussed.

The written evaluation should be <u>specific</u> in terms of a person's strengths and weaknesses. Those areas where improvement is needed should be clearly set forth and recommendations for improvement should be made. Subsequent evaluations should address themselves to any improvement or to any continuing difficulty which is observed.

SOURCE: Monroe, Conn., Board of Education
DATE: 5/12/70

SCHOOL BOARD POLICY SAMPLES (buff sheets) are distributed for demonstration purposes. Contents are not necessarily endorsed by EPS/NSBA. Editing from originals has been for reasons of space and style requirements only.

TEACHER EVALUATION

1. All teachers shall be asked to complete a self-evaluation instrument twice each year. One shall be completed by November 15 and the second by March 15. The principal shall ascertain that each teacher has completed the instrument as requested.

2. Principals shall initiate observations of their teaching staff before the development of formal written evaluations: Teachers shall be notified in advance of at least one observation and receive no advance notice for at least one observation.

3. Teachers shall be required to request that the principal observe a lesson of his or her choice at least once prior to the written formal evaluation. The principal should make every effort to honor this request but the teacher requirement is satisfied with the issuance of one invitation.

4. The Formal Written Evaluation should list both strengths and weaknesses. The areas of weakness where improvement is needed should be accompanied by recommendations for improvement. Subsequent evaluations shall address themselves to those recommendations and comment on improvement or continuing difficulty.

5. The Formal Written Evaluations shall be narrative in style and shall address itself to, but not be limited to, the following:

   a. Professional competence
   b. Effectiveness as a teacher
   c. Classroom management and control
   d. Professionalism
   e. Planning and preparations
   f. Extra-curricular and total school contributions

6. Formal Written Evaluations shall be completed for nontenure teachers by December 1 and again by February 15, and for tenure teachers by February 15.

7. Principals shall submit to the Superintendent no later than November 1 the names of any teachers whose work is unsatisfactory or about whom the principal has concern. Additional evaluations on these teachers shall be completed by May 25. Evaluations of teachers, tenure or nontenure about whom there is concern, shall be specific in terms of any deficiency noted. They should contain: Suggestions for improvement; provision for extra-supervisory assistance; any conditions to be met; and recommendations concerning reemployment.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES SAMPLES (yellow sheets) are distributed for demonstration purposes. Contents are not necessarily endorsed by EPS/NSBA. Editing from originals has been for reasons of space and style requirements only.

8. Principals shall prepare, with the Superintendent, a report for the Board on all nontenure teachers and on tenure teachers about whom the principals have concern. This report will be presented at the Board's second meeting in February.

SOURCE: Monroe, Conn., Board of Education
DATE: 5/12/70

TEACHER EVALUATION

The basic purpose of teacher evaluation in the Rapid City Public Schools is to improve student instruction. Evaluation is the procedure for measuring the efficiency and effectiveness of the teacher and his teaching by means of a well-defined criteria. The criteria is extensive in scope, dealing with all phases of the teacher's relationship to his students and his profession. Classroom visitation is an important part of the evaluation process, but visitations to a teacher's classroom shall not be construed to be an evaluation as such under this policy and may be conducted at any time. The Board recognizes that formal education is one of the agencies for providing proper environment for growth and development of the child. Inasmuch as the teacher is the focal point of an effective educational program it is only by continuous evaluation and improvement of all teachers that we may hope to move forward and improve the overall program of the school district.

The Board and the administration shall continue their policy that all monitoring or observation of the work performance of a teacher shall be conducted openly and with full knowledge of the teacher.

Orientation. A professional meeting shall be devoted early in the school year to the policies and procedures of evaluation so that all staff members may have a thorough understanding of the process and purposes of evaluation. A conference may be held with the teacher being evaluated prior to each formal evaluation of the teacher.

Probationary teachers. Probationary teachers are those in first and second year service in Rapid City, regardless of previous experience. Probationary teachers shall be formally evaluated twice each school year (provided they have been employed for at least 2 months prior to the due date of the evaluation). The first evaluation is to be completed by December 20 and the second evaluation is to be completed by March 1. Teachers hired during the school year after February 1 shall be evaluated by the end of the school year and recommendations for reemployment shall be made at that time. The first evaluation will be developed on the form identified as "First Evaluation of New Teachers". All subsequent evaluations will be made on the "Supervisor's or Principal's Teacher Evaluation" form.

Continuing Contract Teachers. Continuing contract teachers are those who have completed two successive years of service in Rapid City. Continuing contract teachers shall be formally evaluated at least every third year unless a situation develops which indicates a need for an earlier evaluation. This evaluation shall be made once during the school year and shall be completed by March 1.

SCHOOL BOARD POLICY SAMPLES (buff sheets) are distributed for demonstration purposes. Contents are not necessarily endorsed by EPS/NSBA. Editing from originals has been for reasons of space and style requirements only.

Evaluation Form. When an evlauation form has been completed by the principal and/or supervisor, a conference shall be held with each teacher to discuss the evaluation. When completed, all evaluation forms shall be signed both by the principal and/or supervisor making the evaluation and the teacher, and a copy of such completed form given to the teacher. Signing of the form by the teacher shall not imply agreement with the evaluation but merely indicates that the evaluation was discussed.

Recommendations. Evaluations which are conducted and are to be completed under the policy by March 1 shall be checked in one of three categories--(1) recommended; (2) recommended with qualifications; or (3) not recommended.

When the evaluation "recommended with qualifications" is contemplated, the teacher involved shall be apprised of the contemplated evaluation in a conference to be held at least 30 days before March 1. The teacher shall be advised in writing relative to areas in which improvement is necessary.

Before a teacher is given the evaluation "not recommended," the principal and/or supervisor conducting the evaluation shall have a minimum of two conferences with the teacher relative to the areas of weakness. The first of these conferences shall be held not less than 45 days before March 1. The basis and reasons for the contemplated evaluation shall be discussed and remedial measures suggested to the teacher in writing.

SOURCE: Board of Education, Rapid City Independent School District, South Dakota
DATE: 1970

FIRST EVALUATION OF NEW TEACHERS

Teacher's Name _____

Assignment _____ Building _____

1. Describe this teacher's ability to manage his classroom and create a good environment for learning.

2. Relate your evaluation of this teacher's academic training and background.

3. Describe this teacher's professional attitudes.

4. Discuss this teacher's relationship with other staff members.

5. Relate your evaluation of this teacher's personality.

6. Enumerate the things <u>you</u> have done to assist this teacher.

(Use back of form if more space is needed)

Dated _____ Signed _____
(Principal)

Signed _____
(Teacher)

Signing shall not imply agreement by the staff member to the evaluation, but merely indicates that the above information has been discussed.

<u>Please return to Personnel Office</u>

SOURCE: Board of Education, Rapid City Independent School District, South Dakota
DATE: 1970

17

INFORMATION STATEMENTS (green sheets) are distributed for information only. Contents are not necessarily endorsed by EPS/NSBA. Editing from originals has been for reasons of space and style requirements only.

TEACHER EVALUATION

All teachers are evaluated annually until tenure has been granted and at least every third year thereafter. The primary objectives of the evaluation program are:

1. To help the employee improve his effectiveness in the performance of his duties and establish specific goals to stimulate improvement and professional growth and thereby strengthen and improve the instructional program.

2. To help the employee gain a better understanding of the duties and responsibilities of his contractual obligation.

3. To identify leadership qualities and potential.

4. To help the employee identify his own strengths and possible areas for further growth.

5. To enable the Superintendent to classify all professional certificates as required by Public School Laws of Maryland, Article 77, Section 110.

SOURCE: Montgomery County Public Schools, Rockville, Md.
DATE: 7/1/69 (revised)

SCHOOL BOARD POLICY SAMPLES (buff sheets) are distributed for demonstration purposes. Contents are not necessarily endorsed by EPS/NSBA. Editing from originals has been for reasons of space and style requirements only.

TEACHER EVALUATION

Appropriate members of the administrative and supervisory staff are assigned the responsibility of observing and evaluating an employee's effectiveness in the performance of his duties.

1. Teachers must be evaluated annually until tenure status is attained and at least every third year during the tenure period of employment.

2. Conferences as needed, should be requested by the teacher in order to seek professional assistance and guidance.

3. Prior to the formal evaluation, conferences, as needed, should be scheduled by the appropriate administrator or supervisor to assist and counsel the teacher in areas of performance which need improvement.

4. At the direction of the Superintendent, the deputy superintendent, or the appropriate assistant superintendent, a formal evaluation may be scheduled at any time.

Professional personnel who receive an unsatisfactory evaluation in any category may be terminated in accordance with "The Public School Laws of Maryland"; not have the contract renewed; or have their certificate rated second-class by the Superintendent and may not advance on the salary schedule. Professional personnel may not hold a second-class certificate more than two consecutive years.

Responsibility of the Department of Professional Personnel.

1. Notifying the appropriate evaluator of those employees who must be evaluated, the purpose of the evaluation (first year, second year, tenure, etc.), and forwarding the appropriate evaluation form.

2. Receiving, reviewing, and maintaining evaluations of professional employees.

3. Preparing and forwarding written notification to employees whose names are listed on the mid-year evaluation report that the employee's services must be improved.

4. Notifying, for appropriate action, the assistant superintendent for personnel services of the names of those employees who receive an unsatisfactory evaluation.

Responsibility of the Evaluator.

The principal is responsible for the evaluation program for all

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES SAMPLES (yellow sheets) are distributed for demonstration purposes. Contents are not necessarily endorsed by EPS/NSBA. Editing from originals has been for reasons of space and style requirements only.

professional personnel assigned to, or based at, his or her school. At the beginning of the school year, or at the beginning of the employment period, the evaluation program and procedures should be reviewed with the employee(s). As a basis for discussion, a copy of the appropriate MCPS evaluation form should be made available to the employee(s).

1. The evaluator must be familiar with the employee's effectiveness in the performance of his duties as it relates to the specific areas defined on the evaluation instrument.

2. He must observe the employee in his performance of his duties and confer with the employee periodically. *All observations of the work of a unit member will be conducted openly and with the observer visible to the unit member.* [*Article 16, Section A. 1.*]

3. *Upon written request, unit members will be given a copy of any class visit or evaluation report prepared by their administrator or supervisor at least one day before a conference is held to discuss it. No such report will be submitted to the central office, placed in the unit member's file, or otherwise acted upon before the conference with the unit member. Unit members will be required to sign the evaluation memorandum as evidence that they have seen it. They will not be required to sign a blank or incomplete evaluation form.* [*Article 16, Section A. 2.*]

4. The evaluator must bring to the attention of the appropriate official those employees whose quality of service needs to be improved.

5. The evaluator must arrange for other appropriate administrative supervisors,or resource personnel to observe, counsel, and assist the employee whose quality of service needs to be improved.

6. *Prior to any evaluation of a unit member, the principal or his immediate supervisor will have had appropriate communication with said unit member regarding his work performance.* [*Article 16, Section D.*]

7. Prior to January 15, the appropriate administrator or supervisor must confer with employees whose services need to improve and review with the employee (a) the necessity for improvement in his work, (b) the areas in which improvement must be made, and (c) the pertinent concerns which are to be reported on the mid-year evaluation.

8. The evaluator must submit to the Department of Professional Personnel a mid-year evaluation report listing the names of those employees whose continued service is in question at the time the report is submitted. The report is to be submitted in duplicate, through the appropriate official, by January 15.

9. The evaluator must continue to assist, encourage, observe, and evaluate the employee(s).

10. The evaluator must schedule an evaluation conference with each employee for whom a formal evaluation must be submitted. The employee should be given sufficient notice of the scheduled appointment.

11. *Complaints regarding a unit member made to any member of the administration by any parent, student, and/or other person that are used in the evaluation of the unit member will be called to his attention. If the complaint is in writing, the unit member will be required to initial the material indicating that he has read it. He will be permitted to attach his comments relating to the complaint. Reprisals taken by a unit member against any student, or any class, or any person will be cause for an immediate investigation that may result in dismissal proceedings being activated.* [*Article 16, Section C.*]

SOURCE: Montgomery County Public Schools, Rockville, Md.
DATE: 7/1/69 (revised)

TEACHER EVALUATION

ALL EMPLOYEES SHALL BE EVALUATED WITH EMPHASIS ON PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND IMPROVEMENT OF SERVICES.

The Temple City Unified School District believes that any evaluation has but one purpose--the improvement of instruction and a better educational program through staff growth. The identification of teacher strengths and weaknesses is the basis for assistance towards teacher growth and the correction of any deficiencies. That the observations and appraisals also provide a sound basis for administrative decisions on continued employment or dismissal is a bonus value and is not the basic purpose of evaluation.

SOURCE: Temple City, Calif., Unified School District
DATE: 1970-71

SCHOOL BOARD POLICY SAMPLES (buff sheets) are distributed for demonstration purposes. Contents are not necessarily endorsed by EPS/NSBA. Editing from originals has been for reasons of space and style requirements only.

TEACHER EVALUATION

The reemployment recommendations for all teachers rests with the principal and must be submitted to the Superintendent by March 1 of each year. The principal may share the responsibility for evaluation with senior teachers and other administrators. For purposes of evaluation, any teacher may request and be granted a reasonable number of days of consecutive or nonconsecutive evaluation at a mutually agreed upon time.

All evaluations should be based upon wide observation of the teacher's work, spaced over a sufficient period of time to allow for an adequate sampling of the teacher's performance. Any recorded observations by the evaluator will include statements of classroom visitations and pertinent data from other sources as well. Signed and dated copies of such records shall be made in triplicate with one copy being placed in the confidential folder of the teacher at school, the second copy being given to the teacher, and the third copy going to the Personnel Office of the District to be placed in his permanent personnel folder.

First Year Probationary Teachers. First year probationary teachers shall be evaluated formally and in writing at least once each school quarter. Additional appraisals may be made based upon visits, observations, and conduct related to school activities. In the event the principal or senior teacher feels that "improvement is needed" as noted on the rating device, he will state the specific problems as he sees them and outline a cooperatively determined course of action leading to improvement on the teacher's part. A conference shall be held between the teacher and principal, or senior teacher, at which time the evaluation form is filled out and signed by each one. One copy of the form shall be made for the teacher, one copy for the Personnel Office, and one copy for the principal or senior teacher's file.

Second and Third Year Probationary Teachers. Except for the required number of formal evaluation periods--now reduced to once a semester for second and third year probationary teachers--the principal, or senior teacher, shall be guided by the same requirements as are recommended for first year probationary teachers.

Permanent Teachers. All permanent (tenure) teachers will be evaluated at least once each school year. Such evaluations may be formal or informal. A formal evaluation will be conducted upon the request of the teacher or by administrative decision.

SOURCE: Temple City, Calif., Unified School District
DATE: 1970-71

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES SAMPLES (yellow sheets) are distributed for demonstration purposes. Contents are not necessarily endorsed by EPS/NSBA. Editing from originals has been for reasons of space and style requirements only.

TEACHER EVALUATION COMMITTEE

For teachers who have been identified by the principal, or senior teacher, as having a serious problem or problems, a committee will be formed to assist the teacher in correcting these deficiencies. The committee will be composed of three people--two members to be appointed by the principal or senior teacher, (one of whom may be the principal or senior teacher) and a person of the teacher's choice.

The committee will operate under the following procedures:

1. The teacher will be invited to all committee meetings.

2. The committee will meet with the principal to discuss the problem or problems.

3. The committee will analyze and study the situation and develop a system for proceeding.

4. The committee will make suggestions to the teacher in writing for remedying the situation as they see it.

5. The work of the committee should normally be concluded within a 60 calendar day period. At the conclusion of this period, the committee will submit its findings to the principal. Differences of opinion will be included.

6. The principal or senior teacher will consider these findings in making his final recommendation for reemployment.

7. The committee findings will become a part of the teacher's personnel record.

It should be understood that the committee is in no way voting on behalf of, or against, the teacher. This committee is designed to improve the situation. In the event the committee encounters difficulty the Director of Personnel may be contacted for assistance. The above procedures shall be followed before any teacher is recommended for dismissal.

SOURCE: Temple City, Calif., Unified School District
DATE: 1970-71

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES SAMPLES (yellow sheets) are distributed for demonstration purposes. Contents are not necessarily endorsed by EPS/NSBA. Editing from originals has been for reasons of space and style requirements only.

TEACHER EVALUATION
(Expectancy Criteria for Teachers--Explanation of Terms)

These notes expand upon the area of evaluation included on the Temple City Teacher Evaluation Form.

A. Instructional Capabilities in the Classroom.

1. Knowledge - Exhibits competency and fluency in major field and in other subject fields taught; knows objectives of each subject taught; has knowledge of related fields.

2. Planning for Instruction - Plans in light of objectives and needs of class, group, and individual; does long-term planning with clear and purposeful aims; does careful, purposeful preparation; encourages pupil participation in planning when appropriate; helps pupils to be clearly aware of work planned.

3. Instructional Techniques - Knows and uses methods that achieve objectives of subjects taught; evaluates effectiveness of methods; uses variety of materials and methods to meet individual differences and needs; encourages independent study; stimulates pupils to think critically; develops self-evaluation on the purposeful assignments; provides effective, continuous motivation.

4. Teaching Results - Classroom behavior indicates that class, school, and District objectives are being met; pupils readily participate in class planning and discussions; pupil growth and achievement based upon individual competencies are evidenced by teacher-made and District tests; promotes and stresses socially accepted attitudes as part of the learning climate.

5. Room Environment - Reflects purposes of subjects taught and work in progress; includes a rich variety of appropriate materials which stimulate thinking on the part of the pupil; is attractive, neat, and orderly; uses purposeful pupil-made materials; shows evidence of skills developed at the particularl level; shows well-organized, working arrangement of desks and other equipment; provides for the health and safety of pupils; interprets programs clearly to visitors.

B. Relationships.

1. Teacher-Pupil Relationships - Understands and makes

INFORMATION STATEMENTS (green sheets) are distributed for information only. Contents are not necessarily endorsed by EPS/NSBA. Editing from originals has been for reasons of space and style requirements only.

allowances for the individual abilities and needs of pupils; has a positive attitude toward each pupil and guides him in the analysis and solution of his problems; looks for causes of behavior and uses intelligent guidance techniques; helps pupils develop proper attitudes and desirable work and study habits.

2. Teacher-Staff Relationships - Is generally accepted by the school staff; contributes to the professional planning of the staff; accepts full share of responsibility for school activities outside the classroom; shows a professional attitude toward all school employees.

3. Teacher-Parent Relationships - Works cooperatively with parents in order that the teacher and parent may understand the pupil's progress and his development; works with parents toward an understanding of present day educational philosophy and practices.

4. Teacher-Community Relationships - Uses resources within the community to enrich classroom instruction; plans personal out-of-school activities so as not to conflict with professional obligations to the school; exercises judgment in discussing school problems.

C. Professional Attitudes and Responsibilities.

1. Professional Growth - Avails himself of opportunities to grow in his profession including inservice training as well as college and university work, travel, and work experience. Is knowledgeable of trends in his field.

2. Philosophy of Education - Demonstrates in classroom and school a sound educational philosophy in harmony with the basic principles of the District's program and education in a democratic society.

3. Adaptability - Is willing to seek and try new ideas; seeks assistance of administrators and service personnel when needed; accepts and puts to use constructive suggestions when needed.

4. Ethics - Conducts himself ethically and in a manner becoming a member of the profession in good standing; is tolerant, reliable, and has integrity; respects the confidential nature of professional information; respects and adheres to channels of authority; assumes his responsibilities as a teacher and as a citizen.

D. Personal Characteristics.

1. Attitudes - Likes pupils; accepts pupils as they are as

a basis for teaching and guidance; is considerate of others.

2. Physical and Mental Health - Has the physical health needed to meet the responsibilities required of the job, including reasonable assignments in addition to his regular teaching load; adjusts to new situations; is controlled and effective under pressure; has mature understanding of his own and other problems.

3. Accuracy - Keeps and makes careful, correct records and reports; is accurate in interpreting announcements contained in bulletins and instructions; meets obligations on time.

4. Communication - Expresses ideas clearly and accurately, both in speaking and writing.

5. Personal Appearance - Appearance and dress meet professional standards; mode of dress is appropriate to the occasion and to the function; good grooming is practiced.

6. Judgment and Tact - Tries to understand both sides of a question; demonstrates independence and maturity of thought in reaching decisions; uses good judgment and tact.

SOURCE: Temple City, Calif., Unified School District
DATE: 1970-71

TEACHER EVALUATION
(An Advisory Committee's Ideas for More Effective Evaluations)

We are of the opinion that...reasonably effective evaluation is crucial to the achievement of [educational] aims. A more proficient system should be established.

Evaluation should be annual regardless of tenure or other status and based on all informed sources including students, teachers, and administrators. Each source should be assessed fairly by the evaluating authority as to weight. The evaluating criteria should be related to the performance of teaching-learning duties, and they to the aims of the system. Final evaluative authority should reside in the chief administrative officer of the school concerned, with his performance evaluated annually by his superiors with serious consequences--supportive, adverse, or both.

Expanded Comments

Evaluative Criteria. Proper evaluation criteria, though necessarily overlapping, ought to include:

a. Ability to communicate with the young.
b. Effective teaching style
c. Evidence of independent learning and teaching
d. Knowledge of, and excitement with, subject
e. Participation in curriculum-making
f. Experimental attitudes and ability to adjust to change
g. Participation in the governance of the school
h. Publications, degrees, memberships, honors, and performance as evaluated in the past.

Evaluative criteria inappropriate to either aims or performances of teaching duties are dress, manners, appearance, personal views, and popularity. (A majority of us would add to this list of inappropriate criteria accumulated graduate credits and cooperativeness.) Criteria such as "personality" and "emotional balance" should likewise be ruled out except as assessed in special cases by qualified professionals in psychiatry.

Consequences of Evaluation. Every evaluation should have supportive or adverse consequences, sometimes both. Pay raises, promotion, lighter teaching load, paid leave for study, more control of one's time, a desired transfer, official encouragement, counseling and guidance, and medical and psychiatric assistance are examples of supportive measures. Holding in grade, demotion, transfer within or out of the system, a fair trial on issues of competence, and dismissal are examples of adverse consequences. Humanitarian consid-

INFORMATION STATEMENTS (green sheets) are distributed for information only. Contents are not necessarily endorsed by EPS/NSBA. Editing from originals has been for reasons of space and style requirements only.

erations are surely acceptable in modifying adverse consequences of every kind, provided the damage to student learning effectively ceases.

Broad Involvement. Student participation in teacher evaluations at junior and senior high school levels, though it should not be required, should be formalized, perhaps by a sensible questionnaire. Teacher participation in the evaluations of other teachers should be formalized and documented but not required. Parents of children may be legitimately consulted or heard on teacher evaluation issues.

Confidentiality and Due Process. Teachers have a right to be informed as to the results of evaluations but not the identities of the contributors. The evaluations are otherwise to be treated as confidential within and outside the system. In a trial on competency issues, a teacher has the right to confront and cross-examine complainants and witnesses.

Ultimate Authority. The ultimate authority as to evaluation, its consequences, and the weight assigned to information from contributing sources should reside in the senior administrative officer of the school concerned, in consultation with such other officers, teachers, students, and parents as he may choose. His annual and past performances of the evaluation assignment should be evaluated by his superiors, with consequences.

. . . . .

Though this outline of a system may not be defensible in detail, we believe its elements--frequency, documentation, assessment of evidence, criteria related to the aims of the system, practical rewards and penalties as consequences of each evaluation, wider participation, and a final authority which is itself evaluated--ought not to be rejected without good reason. The important function of teacher evaluation should be given wider parameters of time and cost. The cost of retaining incompetent teachers is incalculable.

SOURCE: Cleveland Heights-University Heights Lay Committee on a Philosophy of Education
DATE: 8/20/69

TEACHER EVALUATION
(NEA Resolution)

The National Education Association believes that it is a major responsibility of educators to participate in the evaluation of the quality of their services. To enable educators to meet this responsibility more effectively, the Association calls for continued research and experimentation to develop means of objective evaluation of the performance of all educators, including identification of (a) factors that determine professional competence; (b) factors that determine the effectiveness of competent professionals; (c) methods of recognizing effective professional service; and (d) methods of recognizing effective professional service through self-realization, personal status, and salary.

The Association insists that each educator have access to all items in his personnel file, except privileged communications related to his initial employment, and shall have the right to attach a written response to any item. A procedure shall be established to remove inappropriate or unfounded material from personnel files. A copy of any evaluation report placed in the educator's file must be given to the educator.

The Association further believes that use of subjective methods of evaluating professional performance for the purpose of setting salaries has a deleterious effect on the educational process.

The Association believes that the use of examinations such as the National Teacher Examination is an undesirable method for evaluating educators in service for purposes such as salary, tenure, retention, or promotion. Such examinations should not be used as a condition of employment of an educator when the candidate is a graduate of an institution accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

SOURCE: Continuing Resolution #6, "Evaluation and Subjective Ratings," National Education Association
DATE: Reaffirmed, July, 1970

INFORMATION STATEMENTS (green sheets) are distributed for information only. Contents are not necessarily endorsed by EPS/NSBA. Editing from originals has been for reasons of space and style requirements only.

TEACHER EVALUATION
(Elements Often Included in Negotiated Contracts)

NOTE: During the 1967-68 school year, approximately 63% of the 603 comprehensive agreements on file with NEA Research Division covering teaching staffs in school systems enrolling 1,000 or more pupils contained clauses on the evaluation of teachers. These were among the most common provisions:

1. The time schedule for evaluations, including the number, frequency, and length of individual observation sessions.

2. Designation of the evaluator, usually the teacher's immediate supervisor or the school principal.

3. Statement that all observations must be with the knowledge of the teacher, and that monitoring devices may not be used without the teacher's prior consent.

4. Requirement that all evaluations be in writing on a standard form.

5. Provision for the teacher's review of the written evaluation report and opportunity to respond to any adverse comments before the report is placed in his personnel file.

6. Statement that teachers may be accompanied by an organization representative when discussing evaluation reports with supervisors.

7. Grievance procedure indicated as a channel for resolving objections a teacher may have to his evaluation.

8. Provision for special assistance to teachers receiving unsatisfactory evaluations to help them improve their performance. After a specified period of time, such teachers are re-evaluated and improvement, if any, is recorded.

9. Special provisions for the evaluation of new or probationary teachers. Tenure teachers are to be evaluated less frequently than probationary teachers.

SOURCE: NEA Research Bulletin, October, 1969, pp. 72-73.

INFORMATION STATEMENTS (green sheets) are distributed for information only. Contents are not necessarily endorsed by EPS/NSBA. Editing from originals has been for reasons of space and style requirements only.

For further reading...

° "Appraising Teacher Performance" by Dennis M. McFadden and E. Allen Schenck in Battelle Research Outlook, Volume 2, Number 2, 1970. A description of a pilot project designed to produce the prototype for a new evaluation system based on sharply-defined "critical teaching incidents." Battelle Memorial Institute, 505 King Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43201. Single copy free while supplies last.

° The Evaluatee Evaluates the Evaluator. Description of programs in which students evaluate teachers and teachers evaluate principals. Educational Research Service, 1201 Sixteenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. 1970. 52 pp. $1.50.

° "Evaluation of Teaching Competence" in NEA Research Bulletin, October, 1969. A survey report on evaluation practices in 213 school systems. NEA, 1201 16th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 60¢.

° How Students Rate Their Schools and Teachers by Gordon A. Savine. A doleful report of student attitudes, mostly unfavorable, about the quality of teaching they are getting in high schools. Includes an excellent self-appraisal questionnaire for teachers. National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1201 Sixteenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. 1971. 76 pp. $2.00.

° Measuring Teacher Competence: Research Backgrounds and Current Practice by Ruth Bradley and others. Includes suggested criteria for assessing performance effectiveness of various teacher roles. California Teachers Association, 1705 Murchison Ave., Burlingame, Calif. 94010. 1964. 47 pp. $2.00.

° Teacher Evaluation. One of a series of U.S. Office of Education PREP guides (putting research into practice), National Center for Educational Communications, Washington, D.C. 1971. 57 pp. $2.95. Available from state education departments.